## Case 1:09-cr-00813-DLC Document 75 Filed 09/26/14 Page 1 of 12

E9H3CLAC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 09 CR 813 (DLC) V. 5 NAHEEM CLARK, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. September 17, 2014 9 11:15 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. DENISE COTE, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 AMANDA KRAMER 17 Assistant United States Attorney 18 FASULO SHALLEY & DiMAGGIO Attorneys for Defendant 19 MARGARET SHALLEY ALSO PRESENT: U.S. Probation Officer Theresa Maisano 20 21 22 23 24 25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: United States of America v. Naheem 1 2 Clark. Is the government ready to proceed? 3 MS. KRAMER: Yes. Good morning, your Honor. Amanda 4 Kramer for the government. Joining me at counsel table is 5 Theresa Maisano, a senior U.S. probation officer in this 6 district, and with the Court's permission, Samantha Oakes, an 7 intern with the United States attorney's office. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. 9 THE DEPUTY CLERK: For defendant Clark, are you ready 10 to proceed? 11 MS. SHALLEY: Yes, your Honor. Margaret Shalley for 12 Naheem Clark. Good morning. 13 THE COURT: Good morning. Ms. Shalley, have you and 14 your client both read the presentence report? 15 MS. SHALLEY: The original -- you mean the 16 specifications? 17 THE COURT: I shouldn't say the presentence report. 18 should say I think the most recent one is the March 20, 2013, 19 probation department report. 20 MS. SHALLEY: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Thank you very much. And I have received 22 certain submissions in connection with this sentencing 23 proceeding. I have the defendant's memorandum of September 8

with a request that that be filed under seal. And I think,

actually, it shouldn't be entirely. I think there is very

24

25

limited reference to the defendant's cooperation.

2

MS. SHALLEY: Judge, do you want me to file it on

3

Pacer and just take out the lines related to his --

4 5

permitted by our local ECF rules.

6

MS. SHALLEY: Okay.

7

THE COURT: And just give Ms. Rojas the complete pages for which redactions were taken, and we'll file that under

THE COURT: Yes. You can file it in redacted form as

8

seal.

10

MS. SHALLEY: Thank you.

11

THE COURT: I have a letter from the defendant which

12

parties. And I understand from my deputy that both attorneys

we received yesterday and docketed to give notice to the

1314

have reviewed the defendant's letter which is dated

15

September 11, but was received by us on the 16th and docketed

16

on the 16th. And then I have a letter from Ms. Kramer,

17

one-page letter of September 15.

1819

probation department is no longer recommending a sentence at

20

the high end of the guidelines range of 46 months, but instead

As I remember from the time of the allocution, the

21

is recommending a sentence within the guidelines range which is

22

37 to 46 months. Is that true, Ms. Kramer?

23

MS. KRAMER: Yes, your Honor, that is correct.

24

THE COURT: Is that the government's recommendation as

25

well?

MS. KRAMER: Yes, your Honor. The government notes that the defendant may be sentenced up to five years under the statute, and the guidelines range is 37 to 46 months.

In order to recommend a sentence other than a sentence within the guidelines range, every AUSA would need to seek approval to do that. I did not do that in this case, and intended to simply seek a sentence within the guidelines range.

And I have some hesitation about that after reviewing the defendant's letter to the Court in which he makes a number of statements that are contradicted by the evidence the government would have offered at a hearing, had we had a hearing, had he not entered a plea of guilty.

He seems in his letter to disclaim any responsibility for participating in a conspiracy to distribute narcotics, and indicates that he merely knew that there were drugs in the home --

THE COURT: I don't think he admits that. In fact, I don't see in this letter any admission that he had knowledge that Mr. Cruz had drugs.

MS. KRAMER: I think, your Honor, your Honor is correct. He says "I know Mr. Cruz to be a user of drugs and a dealer of." But are you're right, your Honor. He doesn't actually say he knew those specific drugs were there. He says he called Mr. Cruz and then he moved his drugs. And he says "I did not have a stake in Mr. Cruz's drugs."

Cruz entered a guilty plea in Tioga County on May 31, 2013, in which during his allocution, he said "Me, Naheem, and Norma Jamie, we all was aware we had the drugs.

"The Court: Were you in a friend's house?

"The Defendant: We was in a friend's house.

"The Court: You were at a friend's house and what happened?

"Cruz: We were basically staying there partying where I was using some drugs, and at the same time we were also selling some. We was also selling some of what I was using."

So, notwithstanding all of the statements in the letter, I mean, there is plenty more. I represented to the Court what the evidence would be at the hearing when we were ready to proceed to a hearing, and the defendant entered a plea of guilty to possession with intent to distribute.

THE COURT: Hold on one second. I don't remember your description of what the evidence would have shown.

MS. KRAMER: I think, your Honor, it was not at the plea proceeding. It was at the prior conference in the context of discussing to what extent the government would be offering direct proof and to what extent it would be offering some proof in the form of hearsay. But, I can summarize, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I will want that on the record. I will want that on the record today again.

But, let me just as a procedural matter find out if the defendant wishes to withdraw his admission of a violation

as charged in Specification One. 1 2 (Defendant conferring with his attorney) 3 MS. SHALLEY: No, your Honor. He does not. THE COURT: Have you had enough time talk to with your 4 5 client about that decision to feel comfortable, Ms. Shalley, or 6 do you need more time? 7 MS. SHALLEY: I actually only was aware of the letter 8 this morning. 9 THE COURT: I think we had a break of about 20 10 minutes, and I'm happy to give you more time. 11 (Defendant conferring with his attorney) 12 THE COURT: Ms. Shalley, we're going to take a break. 13 MS. SHALLEY: Thank you. 14 THE COURT: Please, take as much time as you need. This is important to the defendant to decide, and of course to 15 you as his counsel. Just let Ms. Rojas know when you'd like to 16 17 resume. 18 MS. SHALLEY: Thank you so much. 19 (Recess) 20 THE COURT: Ms. Shalley, on reflection, I'm wondering 21 if I shouldn't put this sentence over for a day or two to give 22 you and your client an opportunity to carefully think about 23 these issues. 24 THE DEFENDANT: Can I speak by any chance? 25 THE COURT: Consult with Ms. Shalley first.

I'm just going to put this over.

MS. SHALLEY: I understand.

THE COURT: I don't want there to be any concern on the defendant's part, ever, not today, not in the future, that there was a need to rush for him to make a decision about these issues. This is important to him. I'm going to sentence him at some point here. I mean, theoretically if he did decide to make a motion to withdraw, we'd play that out and I would decide whether or not to give him that opportunity. And theoretically there might end up being a hearing, and the government would be put to its proof and it would or wouldn't carry that burden. I just want to make sure that we're all being careful here.

MS. SHALLEY: I understand.

MS. KRAMER: Your Honor, if I may say something for the record. In the weeks leading up to the scheduled hearing and ultimately the defendant's guilty plea, I believe approximately one week before the hearing was to take place, I engaged in numerous conversations with Ms. Shalley during which she vigorously advocated for her client. I produced to her all of the evidence that I intended to offer and gave her updates as we got closer, including the 3500 material for all the witnesses that I intended to call. And I understand from my conversations with her that she went over all of that with the defendant prior to his guilty plea. And she's continued to

advocate vigorously for him leading up to the sentencing.

So, I agree completely with the Court's decision to put this over so they have additional time to consult and so that the defendant doesn't ever have any doubt about the vigorous and dedicated representation that Ms. Shalley has given to this case.

THE COURT: I think I'm going to ask the government to put on the record a description, it doesn't have to be a complete description, but a substantial description of the evidence that it intended to offer at the hearing.

MS. KRAMER: Certainly, your Honor. First, the government intended to call two law enforcement witnesses, detectives from a narcotics task force in upstate New York who were working on the investigation that ultimately led to this defendant's arrest. One of those detectives engaged in surveillance of the defendant the day of his arrest and had previously conducted surveillance, seeing the defendant drive the car that he was arrested driving. And in fact, only saw the defendant driving that car until the day of his arrest when it appeared that the defendant had noticed that he was being followed by law enforcement, at which point he had the passenger in the car pull over. The defendant had the passenger in the car get in the driver's seat, and the defendant got into the back seat and crouched down and hid until the car ultimately went back to the house, apparently

against the defendant's wishes, according to the testimony of the driver of that car in the grand jury in Tioga County.

But the surveilling agent would testify that the car pulled back in front of the house. The woman who was driving got out, and police officers encountered the defendant hiding in the back seat on the floor of the car.

That same detective would testify as to some of the physical evidence that was found in that car. There was a wallet containing fraudulent identification with the defendant's photograph but another person's contact information, which was a real identification document obtained from South Carolina. That car also contained black rubber bands in the glove compartment that were the same type of rubber bands that were used to make the heroin bundles that were recovered by a different detective from behind the house where Clark's co-conspirator, Manuel Cruz, tried to hide the drugs.

Another detective who did the search of the house and actually found the heroin would testify that she was conducting surveillance on the house, and received a call from the detective who was doing surveillance of Clark's car. And she received a call saying, basically, I think Clark has made us, he's seen the surveillance. And very shortly thereafter, Manuel Cruz jumped out of the window of the house, and tried to hide a bag behind the house, and that bag was determined to

contain bundles of heroin. Cruz was arrested and the house was searched.

The same detective who did the search would testify there was a bedroom that appeared to be occupied by Clark. The clothes were Clark's size. They would not have fit anyone else in the house. Manuel Cruz was not the same size as Clark. And in that bedroom, there was a digital scale, of the type commonly used by drug dealers to weigh drugs and packaging. And also that is the bedroom that another witness testified in the state grand jury was being occupied by Clark.

The government would also call one or both of the lay witnesses who testified in the grand jury in the state. One of them testified that she had been basically selling drugs and staying at that house with Manuel Cruz and with Naheem Clark for approximately one month prior to the date of the arrest. And that they were all in it together selling heroin and crack cocaine.

And the other witness was the driver of the car who testified in the grand jury about the way things happened that day, that they were selling drugs in her house, and she knew about it, and would describe Clark basically telling her to drive and to pull over that day because the police were following them.

If the government couldn't call those witnesses directly, the government would attempt to offer their testimony

in the state grand jury, which was sworn testimony, through another witness.

The government would also introduce physical evidence, as we've already described, the digital scale, rubber bands, and text messages that were taken from the phones that were seized from Cruz and Clark the day of the arrest. Text messages between the two of them evince a drug distribution conspiracy. There is slang used, and the detective from Tioga County could testify about the meaning of that slang. It is fairly plain that it was discussion between two drug dealers about their sale of drugs.

I think that's a fairly complete testimony, although I may be leaving some things out. Oh, and as I said earlier, your Honor, Manuel Cruz gave that allocution during his plea in the state, and the government would attempt to offer that as well.

THE COURT: Ms. Rojas, please give us an adjourn date here.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, the Court is available Friday, September 19, at 3:30.

MS. KRAMER: Thank you very much. That works for the government, your Honor.

MS. SHALLEY: Thank you.

THE COURT: The record should reflect that Ms. Rojas consulted with counsel before making that announcement to get